



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/564,046

05/10/2006

Richard Hendrickus Brinkhuis

00307.0043.PCUS00

5764

23369

7590

03/16/2010

HOWREY LLP-HN

C/O IP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT

2941 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 200

FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042-7195

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAIDUNG D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/16/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed 11/9/09.

Claims 8-11, 13-24 are currently pending.

The previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

The previous anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Kurosaki (JP 2000-226442) is maintained.

The previous obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Buter (4,311,622) in view of Kurosaki (JP 2000-226442) is maintained.

The previous obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Buter (4,311,622) in view of Kurosaki (JP 2000-226442) and Flosbach (6,815,501) is maintained.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to the traversal of restriction of claim 12, it is noted that claim 1 recites a rheology modification agent obtainable either by reacting one or more polyisocyanates ... with one or more optically active carbon-substituted methylamines of the formula (I) not as racemic mixture, **or** by reacting one or more polyamines ... with one or more optically active monoisocyanates of the formula (II) not as racemic mixture, not both reactions, either one can be selected for prosecution. Since the former was selected for prosecution, the latter and its dependents were withdrawn from consideration. Claim 12 remains withdrawn from prosecution.

With regard to the objection of claim 14, it appears a misunderstanding exists. The Examiner did not object to claim 14, but rather rejected claim 13 for using "preferably" language. However, the rejection is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

With regard to the rejection over Kurosaki, applicant argues that the reference does not teach or suggest a rheology modification agent. However, Kurosaki discloses the product obtained by the chemical reaction as set forth in claim 8 (see the abstract, para 0006 and 0007), it appears that this reaction product would have inherently exhibited rheology modification properties because all the material/chemical limitations of the instant invention have been satisfied. In light of this, it has been found that, products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties and a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. See *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705,709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Kurosaki is silent on the amine being optically active and reaction product being a non-racemic; however, when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention but has basis for shifting the burden of proof to applicant as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § § 2112- 2112.02.

With regard to the rejection over Buter in view of Kurosaki, applicant argues that the examiner has failed to show some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the reference teachings. However, Buter discloses a rheology modification agent (sag

Art Unit: 1796

control agent -abstract) obtained by reacting one or more polyisocyanates (col 1, In 36-57) with one or more methylamine such as .alpha.-methylbutylamine, and .gamma.-methylbutylamine (col 1, In 60-66). Buter does not disclose the monoamine being one or more optically active carbon-substituted methylamines of formula I, wherein the amine of formula I is not an optically active amino acid and not an optically active amino acid ester. In a similar invention, Kurosaki et al discloses a reaction product of one or more polyisocyanates (para 0006) with a methylamine (methylbenzyl amine - para0007) for improve temperature sensitive in adhesive compositions. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed methylbenzyl amine taught by Kurosaki in the theology modification agent of Buter as an equivalent alternative methylamine, for improving the temperature sensitive in laminations and adhesives (para 0025).

Furthermore, claim 8 recites a product-by-process. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product.

The rejection of claims 8-11, 13-24 are maintained for the reasons of records.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haidung D. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)270-5455. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

\HN\
Haidung D Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 1796

3/11/2010

/DOUGLAS MC GINTY/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796